

BUDGET

(Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, over the last 48 hours, this House engaged in its constitutional right of creating a pathway for revenue for the United States of America. Sadly, we ended just a few minutes ago on a Republican budget that cannot claim that it will, in essence, reduce the deficit or create a surplus in any given year.

I am delighted to have supported the Democratic budget that reduces the deficit and reaches a primary balance by 2018. But more importantly, I think I am very delighted that the American people will see a heart in this budget: that we will not destroy Medicare; that we will not burden on seniors the extra \$12,000 that seniors will have to pay—that is right, \$12,000—in the Medicare program under the Republican plan; and that young people will not be prevented at the doors of colleges from going to school, and that Head Start will end and Medicaid for the disabled and seniors will end.

I do have faith in this country, and I believe we will get a budget that is both merciful and balanced the right way for the American people, not the wrong way. Today, unfortunately, we made a wrong step, but I believe together we will make it right.

BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STIVERS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, recently I have given several Special Order speeches about my view of the Constitution, making the argument for why I think it should be amended to include certain basic rights for the American people that they currently lack. These include: the right to a high-quality education, the right to health care, and equal rights for women.

Equal rights for women, alone, Mr. Speaker, would be responsible for providing an extraordinary amount of income for 51 percent of households headed by women if women in our society were simply paid at the same rate that their counterparts in the workforce are paid. Equal rights. Equal rights for women, alone, as a fundamental right, would strengthen our economy.

This afternoon, my Special Order time will be used to discuss the continuing resolution for fiscal year 2011, the Republican proposed fiscal year 2012 budget, which we just voted on, and the balanced budget amendment, or what I've taken to call the "imbalanced budget" amendment. All three of them have something in common.

In an ideal world, my colleague PAUL RYAN would support the idea of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, but such an amendment would have extraordinary implications for our country, extraordinary implications for our Federal Government, and it would be fundamentally in the wrong direction.

And while the Republican proposed budget of fiscal year 2012 does not have the strength of the Constitution of the United States, it is clear to me that Republicans and conservatives in the Republican Party—and some conservatives within the Democratic Party—are forcing the Nation's politics into a consideration of a balanced budget amendment for the Constitution. And I want to talk about that in the context of the 2011 debate, the context of the 2012 debate, and such an amendment.

Before I begin, I want to set the framework for my Special Order.

President Harry Truman, in 1946, said, "All of the policies of the Federal Government must be geared to the objective of sustained full production and full employment."

Today, our country has unemployment that is nearing 9 percent; unemployment nearing 9 percent. Nearly 13 to 14 million Americans are presently unemployed—many of whom are chronically unemployed—and yet, in 1946, President Harry Truman said that the objective of the Federal Government must be "sustained full production and full employment to raise consumer purchasing power and to encourage business investment." There has not been a single bill in this Congress since the 112th Congress has begun to address the issue of full employment.

Secondly, I want to remind the American people, Mr. Speaker, of what William Jennings Bryan said in 1896. He said: I am in favor of an income tax. When I find a man or a woman who is not willing to bear his share of the burdens of the government which protects him or her, I find a man or a woman who is unworthy to enjoy the blessings of a government like ours.

Not long ago, Mr. Speaker, the House passed H.R. 1, a continuing resolution that would have forced middle class and working class Americans to carry the burden of spending cuts. My colleagues across the aisle simplified the impacts of this measure by describing it as "tightening our belts." They seem to be oblivious to the fact that these cuts went deep for those Americans who could least afford them.

H.R. 1—tightening our belts—slashed programs like community health centers specifically designed to provide access to basic health and dental services to underserved communities that may not be otherwise able to care for them.

H.R. 1 tightened our belts through cuts to the National Institutes of Health, setting back development of cancer treatments and cures for other diseases, the impact of which we will feel for years to come as medical professionals are forced to shut down promising research projects.

H.R. 1 tightened our belts by hacking away at training of health professions, reducing this funding by more than 23 percent. Cuts to title VII and title VIII programs that help to train primary health professionals for underserved areas would limit the access of low-income individuals to quality doctors, nurses and physician assistants in their areas.

H.R. 1 tightened our belts by severing title X family planning programs. In doing so, we stepped back in time, preventing lifesaving care from being offered to our Nation's women, specifically women who wouldn't otherwise have access to this kind of care.

The programs I've listed so far provide health services to our Nation, and especially to our most underprivileged populations.

□ 1440

H.R. 1 also tightened our belts with cuts to job-training programs, Head Start, and after-school programs, Pell Grants, Hope VI housing programs, and high-speed rail. These programs were systematically sent to the guillotine.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR
OF H.R. 1081

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1081.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. The people that they serve are not millionaires to whom we generously extended tax cuts. They are not the corporations that eagerly navigate tax loopholes, navigate the walls and the Halls of this Congress every year, costing our Nation billions in revenue. They are everyday, hard-working, middle class, public school educated, checkbook balancing, minimum wage earning mothers and fathers and grandparents who elected each of us, hoping we'd find a way to decrease unemployment and bring America back from the brink.

Mr. Speaker, thankfully our colleagues across the Capitol thought we went a few notches too tight in our belt with H.R. 1, as the Senate refused to take up these cuts. Much of our future long-term budget decisions and discussions to reduce our deficit and get America back on track remain in limbo.

Recently, this discussion had reached a fevered pitch. After multiple short-term extensions of the fiscal year 2011 appropriations legislation, the negotiations between Speaker BOEHNER, Leader REID, and the President had broken down many times throughout the week. We were faced with the threat of the first government shutdown since 1996. Agencies were planning which workers to furlough, national parks and museums were prepared to shut their doors for the weekend, and the